

BEFORE THE
POSTAL REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20268-0001

MAIL PROCESSING NETWORK RATIONALIZATION
SERVICE CHANGES, 2011

Docket No. N2012-1

**RESPONSES OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
WITNESS DAVID WILLIAMS
TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRESORT MAILERS INTERROGATORIES
(NAPM/USPS-T1-1 THROUGH 8)**

The United States Postal Service hereby files the responses of witness David Williams to the above-listed interrogatories of the National Association of Presort Mailers dated February 21, 2012. Each interrogatory is stated verbatim and followed by the response.

Respectfully submitted,

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

By its attorneys:

Anthony F. Alverno, Jr.
Chief Counsel, Global Business

Michael T. Tidwell

475 L'Enfant Plaza West, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20260-1137
(202) 268-2998; Fax -5402
March 6, 2012

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS WILLIAMS
TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRESORT MAILERS INTERROGATORY**

NAPM/USPS-T1-1. Please refer to page 2 of your testimony where you state, “[t]he possible creation of a time-definite surface transportation network that responds to the shift toward destination entry of mail.”

- a. Please confirm that the USPS is conducting an evaluation on drop shipment of First Class mail. If confirmed, can you provide a status on the progress of the evaluation and who is leading it and when do you expect some decision on it. If not confirmed, please explain fully.

RESPONSE

- a. The sentence in my testimony from which the above-quoted excerpt is extracted clearly refers to a June 2008 Network Plan (USPS Library Reference N2012-1/2) which included a proposal for outsourcing of the former Bulk Mail Center network through which First-Class Mail did not flow. Accordingly, there is no basis for interpreting the sentence in my testimony or that portion of the Network Plan as applying to First-Class Mail.

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS WILLIAMS
TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRESORT MAILERS INTERROGATORY**

NAPM/USPS-T1-2. Please refer to page 5 of your testimony where you state, “[o]ne of the ongoing responsibilities of the Network Operations function at USPS headquarters is to explore opportunities to process and transport mail more economically and efficiently. This includes examination of opportunities to utilize existing resources better, as well as analysis of opportunities to eliminate excess capacity.”

- a. Please confirm if the exploration includes the use of supply chain resources e.g. mailing service providers and additional or new work-share incentives to perform more operational processing e.g. primary sort, DPS sort, to gain efficiencies and minimize USPS excess capacity. If confirmed, can you provide the results of the exploration or analyses of any possible alternatives of using supply chain partners to eliminate excess capacity and economically improve efficiencies you are considering. If not confirmed, please explain fully why such alternatives were not considered.

RESPONSE

- a. Not confirmed. The objective and focus of current initiative is to pursue consolidate current postal mail processing and transportation infrastructure based on existing and projected workload. Development and exploration of workshare pricing initiatives are not a Network Operations function.

RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS WILLIAMS TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRESORT MAILERS INTERROGATORY

NAPM/USPS-T1-3. Please refer to page 5 of your testimony where you state, “[a]n analysis of the inefficiencies in the mail processing network was initiated in September 2010, utilizing network modeling tools and techniques described in the Direct Testimony of Emily Rosenberg on Behalf of the United States Postal Service (USPS-T-3). The objective of the modeling exercise was to determine whether excess capacity could be reduced significantly within the network if service obligations and operating constraints driven by current overnight First-Class Mail service standards were changed.”

- a. Please confirm if the modeling include scenarios regarding the use of supply chain resources e.g. mailing service providers and additional or new work-share incentives to create more economical and efficient processing/transport capabilities and eliminate excess capacity. If confirmed, can you provide what modeling was performed and the results of the analysis. If not confirmed, please explain fully the reasoning for not considering these other alternatives.

RESPONSE

- a. Not confirmed. Please see my response to NAPM/USPS-T1-2. The focus has been on determining the degree of consolidation of existing postal infrastructure and reduction of excess capacity to implement. It is not a product redesign or pricing initiative intended to determine the feasibility of different degrees or new levels of mailer worksharing suitable for the future network. After the future network is implemented, it would come as no surprise if (components of) the Postal Service (other than Network Operations) and mailers examined whether corresponding classification and pricing changes should be considered.

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS WILLIAMS
TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRESORT MAILERS INTERROGATORY**

NAPM/USPS-T1-4. Please refer to page 8 of your testimony where you state, “[c]hanges of the magnitude proposed here cannot be implemented without requiring some customers to adjust their mail entry operations or patterns and their delivery expectations, sometimes at a cost to customers who wish to minimize any inconvenience or to preserve levels of service to which they have been accustomed.”

- a. Please confirm if the USPS performed an analysis or stratification of the customer types e.g. mail user (owner), mail service provider, logistics provider, etc... and what impacts e.g. sortation processes, delivery expectations, entry patterns, transportation, etc... would affect mailers/customers and how it would affect them. If confirmed, please provide the details and results of the analysis. If not confirmed, please explain fully.
- b. Please confirm if you have conducted any analysis on what the “cost to the customer” is, what kinds of e.g. operational, logistical, loss revenues, etc. If confirmed, please provide the results of such analysis on the cost to the customer. If not confirmed, please explain why this type of analysis was not considered.

RESPONSE

- a. Not confirmed.
- b. Not confirmed. The Postal Service currently does not have data reflecting the internal cost structures of mailers or mail service providers and is unable to perform such analysis without such information. The Postal Service specifically solicited such data from the mailing industry as part of its Advanced Notice of Proposed rulemaking. The Postal Service received mainly qualitative comments from the mailing industry; however, no comments provided the Postal Service the ability to quantify their operating costs. See the response to NPPC-USPS-T1-8.

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS WILLIAMS
TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRESORT MAILERS INTERROGATORY**

NAPM/USPS-T1-5. Please refer to page 10 where you state, “[A]s described below, in order to achieve significant mail processing consolidation, and generate increased efficiencies in mail processing, a modification to current service standards is necessary.”

- a. Please confirm that the only necessary changes to achieve the efficiencies you need are the service standards changes proposed and there has not been any considerations or analysis conducted that has identified if changes in mail preparation will also be necessary. If not confirmed, please provide details and results of any analysis/considerations performed regarding changes to mail preparations.

RESPONSE

- a. Confirmed.

RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS WILLIAMS TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRESORT MAILERS INTERROGATORY

NAPM/USPS-T1-6. Please refer to page 12 of your testimony where you state “[i]nvestment in additional machinery and facility space was prudent and affordable during periods when mail volume was more robust and growth could confidently be predicted. However, as overall volumes have declined sharply, and the mail mix has changed, service standards and the mail processing network required to meet those standards have remained the same.”

- a. Please confirm that during the times of growth you are referring to USPS also used workshare as a “prudent and affordable” solution to support growth. If confirmed, was this business model ever considered as part of a solution for the service standard and network optimization initiative. If not confirmed, please confirm if the USPS considering using the workshare model in the near future. If a workshare model was not considered as part of the network optimization rationalization, please explain why it was not considered.
- b. Please confirm if any analysis was performed regarding leveraging the Intelligent Mail data capabilities and Full Service mailing to determine if the USPS could reduce its capacity and provide better service than proposed. If confirmed, can you provide the details and results of such analysis. If not confirmed, can you explain these capabilities were not considered as part of a viable solution to necessary network changes.

RESPONSE

- a. The rationale for the development of workshare-based rate categories and price incentives during the latter part of the 20th century is a subject outside the scope of my testimony and expertise. It is a matter best left to those familiar with the rate design testimony of postal witnesses and the recommended decisions of the Postal Rate Commission during that era. I am not sufficiently knowledgeable to say whether worksharing was pursued as "'a prudent and affordable' solution to support growth." From an operational standpoint, I can observe that mailer worksharing has contributed to the Postal Service's ability to process mail with fewer internal operational resources than might have been utilized otherwise. The Postal Service's future approach to worksharing, either as a pricing strategy or resource management strategy, is a matter beyond the scope of my testimony. See my response to NAPM/USPS-T1-3.

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS WILLIAMS
TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRESORT MAILERS INTERROGATORY**

RESPONSE TO NAPM/USPS-T1-6 (continued)

- b. Not confirmed. The Postal Service considers its modeling approach reflected in USPS-T-3 to be reasonable, but does not rule out the possibility of the existence of other potentially reasonable approaches, such as ones that might incorporate Intelligent Mail data capabilities and Full Service mailing data.

RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS WILLIAMS TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRESORT MAILERS INTERROGATORY

NAPM/USPS-T1-7. Please refer to page 19 of your testimony where you state, “[F]irst-Class Mail, the Postal Service intends to preserve the opportunity to establish similar arrangements locally, subject to the following conditions. Properly prepared, sorted and containerized bulk workshare intra-SCF First-Class Mail entered at the destination SCF (or designated facility within its service area) by 8:00 a.m. on operating Day Zero will retain an overnight delivery expectation. In addition, properly prepared, 5-digit or scheme sorted and containerized bulk workshare intra-SCF First-Class Mail entered at the destination SCF (or designated facility within its service area) by 12:00 p.m. on operating Day Zero will retain an overnight delivery expectation. This will allow bulk Presort First-Class Mail users to continue the mutually beneficial practice of engaging in extraordinary preparation that permits entry after the CET in a manner aligned with downstream postal mail sortation operations.”

- a. Please provide more detail on the mail preparation requirements for entering mail by 8:00 AM Day Zero and retain the “overnight delivery expectation.”
- b. Please explain for mail entered at 0800hrs, what are the specific preparation requirements necessary in order to obtain an overnight delivery expectation?
- c. Please confirm whether the “properly prepared” or “extraordinary” mailing preparation requirements be established by the federal register notification process or at the local level. If at the local level, who is responsible for establishing these requirements and how will they be communicated to the mailers.
- d. Please explain whether the “properly prepared” or “extraordinary” requirements involve software or business process changes by the mailer and how long will they have to make the changes and communicate them to their staff and clients.

RESPONSE

- a-b. The proposed requirements are straightforward. Based on the level of presort (SCF or 5-digit), the Intra-SCF mail must be entered at the appropriate SCF by the applicable Critical Entry Time (or entered at another BMEU within the SCF service area by an applicable Critical Acceptance Time), be sorted to either the SCF or 5-digit ZIP level, and meet existing Domestic Mail Manual Presort preparation requirements.
- c. The “extraordinary” preparation is that which qualifies the Intra-SCF or 5-digit Presort to be entered by the designated Critical Entry Time (or CAT) with an expectation of next-day delivery. As is the case today, such mail preparation

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS WILLIAMS
TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRESORT MAILERS INTERROGATORY**

RESPONSE TO NAPM/USPS-T1-7 (continued)

requirements will be uniformly applicable. If any DMM changes are deemed necessary, the Postal Service will continue its practice of implementing them after notice in the Federal Register.

- d. Intra-SCF and 5-digit ZIP presortation are long-standing mail preparation techniques commonly employed by Presort First-Class Mail users. It is assumed that any software changes necessary for such mailers to continue to use these techniques to prepare mail for entry at either noon or 8:00am will range from non-existent to *de minimus*. The degree of internal process change related to the new Critical Entry Times, if any, will vary by mailer. Mailers have been on notice since the September 21 and December 15, 2011 Federal Register notices of the potential for these changes. Those notices have been reinforced by subsequent postal communications, including FAQ postings at www.usps.com and industry briefings and webinars, which have been further reinforced by mailing industry press reports. It is assumed that mailers are making plans to adapt and are communicating potential changes in their operating plan to appropriate employees and that mail preparation service providers are communicating potential changes in operating plans to clients in light of the potential for changes to be implemented as early as the middle of May 2012.

**RESPONSE OF UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE WITNESS WILLIAMS
TO NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRESORT MAILERS INTERROGATORY**

NAPM/USPS-T1-8. Please refer to page 27 of your testimony where you state, “[t]he comments were received over a 30 day period and the customer feedback was thoroughly reviewed and analyzed. Based on the customer feedback received through stakeholder discussion, and through the advanced notice of proposed rulemaking, proposed rules relating to changes to market dominant service standards will be published for notice and comment soon after the filing of the Request in this docket.”

- a. Please confirm if you have any information submitted by mailers/customers indicating how your proposed plan will impact them economically. If confirmed, can you provide the details on how much cost impact by their business processes the mailers/customers submitted.

RESPONSE

- a. Not confirmed. No such quantitative information was provided. See the responses to NAPM/USPS-T1-4 and NPPC-USPS-T1-8.